UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Cry for Brotherhood - - *Edwin Markham*

Mediation in Spain - - *Lola Maverick Lloyd*

Reconciliation in Religion - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Is Labor Going too Far? - - *John Haynes Holmes*

Kaddish in a Cathedral - - *Benjamin Friedman*

My Russian Impressions—Conclusion - - - - - - - - - *Rabindranath Tagore*

VOLUME CXIX NUMBER 8

Chicago, June 21, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 147
Jottings—J. H. H. 150

ARTICLES—

Mediation in Spain—LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD 150
Reconciliation in Religion—VICTOR S. YARROS 152
Is Labor Going Too Far?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 154
Kaddish in a Cathedral—BENJAMIN FRIEDMAN 155
My Russian Impressions, Conclusion—RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Translated by Basanta Koomar Roy) 156

POETRY—

A Cry for Brotherhood—EDWIN MARKHAM 147
America's Travail—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 153
Revolt—LUCIA TRENT 159

THE STUDY TABLE—

New Light on the Old Testament—CHARLES LYTTLE 160
The Shadow of a Superman—ROBERT SCHALLER 161
Major American Poets—C. A. HAWLEY 161

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Appeal for Spain—H. RUNHAM BROWN 162
From Our Readers—E. H. BARRETT 163
JOHN ROWLAND 163
Youth—HENRIETTE POSNER 163
Coöperative Institute—EASTERN COÖPERATIVE LEAGUE 164

THE FIELD—

The Sit-Down Technique—*Fellowship of Reconciliation Council* 146

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Sit-Down Technique

Statement Adopted by Fellowship of Reconciliation Council

Without pretending to exhaust so difficult and complex a subject and recognizing that it is one on which there may be wide differences of opinion among people of good-will, the National Council of the F. O. R. submits the following suggestions on problems raised by the sit-down strikes.

Above all, we believe attention must be fixed upon the reason why workers resort to sit-downs and the result they seek to achieve. That result is not social or political revolution. Workers in basic industries are striking primarily in order to establish the right to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

1. Collective Bargaining—The Basic Issue

All the churches—Jewish, Catholic, Protestant—have long since held that the worker in our modern industrial set-up has no real freedom and can exercise no effective influence in determining the conditions of his work which so largely affect his material and spiritual welfare, save through organization and collective bargaining.

During recent weeks many of our greatest industrial enterprises such as United States Steel, General Electric, General Motors, Chrysler, have entered into collective bargaining relationships with unions. All the arguments which make collective bargaining valid today were also valid a generation ago. Yet for decades many employers, especially in our basic industries, have pursued a policy of bitter anti-unionism, discharge of workers who joined a union, labor espionage, the use of private gunmen, tear gas, and machine guns in industrial disputes. Society and in particular employers cannot expect, in a moral universe, to escape paying some penalty for such policies.

We are convinced, nevertheless, that speedy and general recognition of unionism and acceptance of the policy of collective bargaining by American industrial leaders would

(*Continued on page* 164)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIX | Monday, June 21, 1937 | No. 8

A CRY FOR BROTHERHOOD

Through all these years this people carried chains;
Had dark Assyrias and darker Spains.
They were the tribes of sorrow who were fed
From wells of hate and exile's bitter bread.
They built the tombs of Pharaohs in old years,
Mixing the bricks with tears.
They built but had no houses of their own;
Tyre heard their dirge and Babylon their moan.

And now in Germany we see again
The old hard hand laid on these women and men;
And yet this wondrous race has given birth
To genius and a glory on the earth.
Out of this people came
The Book of books and many a glorious name—
Moses who stood once in the holy place
And gazed upon Jehovah, face to face;
Then standing on the cliffs of Sinai,
He heard the wisdom of the upper sky.
And handed down the Decalogue to be
A law for men on every land and sea.
It was a wisdom-word
That centuries and continents have heard;
And never a man of earth has added to it—
This wonder-wisdom from the Infinite.

Yes, from the trembling lips of many a seer,
The whole wide world has heard, and still can hear
The Psalms, the Torah, and the Talmud speak
Protection for the plundered and the weak.
Shall not this race whose gifts have been so great
Have some protection from the tooth of hate?
They have not yet their safe place in the sun,
They who knew Egypt, who knew Babylon.

Protest this cruel wrong
In thunders of the sermon and the song.
Let cries go forth in shrill temptestuous note!
As if they rose from tempest's roaring throat.
Let there be thunders in the world; let be
A protest that will shake the ruler's knee.
Let there be protest till the happy hour
When Justice shall unclothe her arm of power.

Let there be thunders in the world—yes, more;
Let there be Brotherhood in every shore.
Let all men rise into the higher place
Where they can see God's face in every face.
Let there be Brotherhood; let this long cry
Be heard on earth and under every sky!

—Edwin Markham.

NEWS!

In the New York *Times,* on Friday, June 4, appeared the following Associated Press news despatch on the wedding of Edward, Duke of Windsor, and Mrs. Wallis Warfield, carefully boxed and conspicuously placed at the top of the column:

Bride Begins Day at 8; Is Fully Dressed by 10

Monts, France, June 3.—The wedding day began at 8 A. M. for Mrs. Wallis Warfield when she stepped into filmy lingerie of powder blue.

At 8:15 A. M. Antonio, her hairdresser, arranged her coiffure.

At 10 A. M. Mrs. Warfield stood fully costumed in her light blue wedding gown. She wore a small blue straw toque trimmed with pink and blue feathers.

At 11:42 o'clock she took her place beside the man who had given up the world's greatest throne so he could make her his bride.

At noon Mayor Charles Mercier pronounced them man and wife.

To such inanities are the news standards of even our best newspapers fallen in this age!

INCOME TAX DODGERS

There can be no two opinions about the President's message on the income tax evasion practised by the wealthy in this country. One knows not which to admire more—the Secretary of the Treasury's concrete analysis of the tricks practised by these artful dodgers, or the President's indignant denunciation of such dishonesty; just as one knows not which to condemn more—the cupidity of the men and women who seek out of their abundance to cheat the government, or the profitable connivance of the lawyers who for a price instruct their clients how to do the dirty job. Contrast with this the action of a man like the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, who left a considerable portion of his estate direct to the government for public uses! What Congress must do is clearly stated by Mr. Roosevelt. It must act at once to stop up these holes in the law through which these sleek evaders find it so easy to crawl. In addition, we hope that Congress, in the course of its official inquiries, will make public the names of these tax dodgers whose unscrupulous devices have been so exactly described by Secretary Morgenthau, that the contempt of an out-

raged nation may be poured upon their heads. Also, we would like to see some of these delinquents prosecuted. But here there is difficulty, for the law is itself largely at fault. The holes are there in the statute—either carelessly or deliberately left there by the legislators—just as the long-standing scandals of tax-exempt securities and untaxed salaries of government officials are there. New York State, to its great credit, has just enacted a law making it obligatory for state employes from the Governor down to pay income taxes like all other citizens. Now let the Federal government do the same, as well as put to an end forever all tax-exempt securities. And then plug up those holes! Our income tax should be as simple as that of England—such a per cent on all gross income received from whatsoever source. Then perhaps some of our richest men will actually pay a tax once in a while.

MOLA AND THE SPANISH WAR

While General Mola, the Spanish rebel chieftain killed in the aeroplane disaster, was being buried with all the honors of war in Burgos, rebel flyers were dropping down a fresh shower of bombs upon the civilian population of Madrid and taking the usual death-toll of women and children. When refugee Basque children in England heard of the end of Mola, they cheered lustily and joined in festive celebrations. As though to prove that Mola's death was only an incentive to greater slaughter, the rebel besiegers of Bilbao pressed new attacks upon the wretched city, while the Loyalists released new offensives in the Madrid area. So the horrid work goes on—a war of extinction, with nothing gained for either side, and everything lost to the Spanish people on whose behalf both sides claim to be fighting! Emilio Mola seems to have been the ablest soldier engaged in this hideous Spanish conflict. His military feats plainly outmatched those of his superior, General Franco, and the Loyalist ranks obviously never found his equal. Yet, after weeks of cruel slaughter, Mola was stopped dead before the defenses of Bilbao! Every day that passes, it is being proved anew that in modern warfare a successful offensive has become impossible. This was shown impressively in the World War, and now conclusively in the Spanish War. The preponderance of power, so terrible in terms of modern mechanisms of destruction, has shifted definitely to the defensive—except only in the air, where the attack is irresistible but apparently for some reason still indecisive. This means that modern war is reduced to a competition in extermination, with no result until one side or the other is either wiped out or exhausted. In Spain, the war means the end of the country's life for generations, perhaps forever. In another world conflict, it would mean the extinction of Europe. In sheer barbarism and horror, mankind has never seen anything to compare with what we are seeing today. What a commentary on civilization and Christianity!

THE HARE AND THE TORTOISE

If ever there was a perfect illustration of old Aesop's fable, it is to be found in the recent elevation of Neville Chamberlain to the British premiership. Ambition for this highest office has reigned in the Chamberlain family ever since the early and surpassingly brilliant days of the great Joseph. Here was a man fated, as it were, to succeed the immortal Gladstone. In those unforgettable Liberal days, Joseph Chamberlain seemed to be sweeping toward Downing Street with the speed and surety of lightning. Then came the sensational break with Gladstone, the formation of the Unionist Party, and at last the entrance of Chamberlain into the Tory ranks. Here, as formerly, it seemed as though Joseph Chamberlain must reach the premiership. What could keep him out of that high office? But Balfour was in his way, then came the break in health—and all was over. Of Joseph's two sons, Austin and Neville, it was the former who inherited the swift genius of his father. Austin entered political life early, with the intention and confident anticipation of mounting the heights which a perverse fortune had denied to his famous parent. Neville by comparison was dull and slow. His political career began late and for years seemed to get nowhere. But now Austin is dead, and Neville attains the goal. What is the meaning of this extraordinary tale? Is it all accident, or fate, that the brilliant should fail and the stodgy succeed? Or do we have here a disclosure of a certain innate characteristic of the English people, which helps to account for their stolidity, their firmness, their dull plodding and muddling and which somehow carries through to victory? What Britain seems to fear is the brilliant, and to cling to the commonplace. She seems to desire integrity beyond all flashing genius. Thus, Westminster has never been willing to follow Winston Churchill, as it was never willing to follow his equally brilliant father, Lord Randolph. It took Lloyd George only because of the exigencies of war, but never trusted him, and got rid of him the moment the crisis was over. It turned naturally to Baldwin and Bonar Law, as it had formerly to Lord Salisbury as welcome relief from Gladstone. There's something here that's basic, and we are inclined to think it explains much of English history.

RELIGION IN GERMANY—AND IN AMERICA

American Christians, Protestant and Catholic alike, are bestirring themselves a bit belatedly in opposition to Hitler's war upon the churches. This war was implicit from the start in Naziism, as witness the writings of Rosenberg which were not indicated yesterday, to say nothing of Hitler's own *Mein Kampf* which was written over a dozen years ago! To any one with half an eye, unblinded by prejudice or dulled by indifference, it must have been evident that the attack upon the Jews in Germany could only

end with a similar attack upon the Christians. The Old Testament was too closely bound to the New Testament to be destroyed alone! What is rampant in Nazi Germany today is a paganism necessarily hostile to anything, either Jewish or Christian, which is ethical and spiritual in character. Side by side with this is a nationalism which is similarly hostile to anything apart from the state itself. This nationalism is the new religion which the Nazis would now exalt above Christianity. They would substitute the state for God, der Fuehrer for Christ, and all the paraphernalia and performances of patriotism for the rites of divine worship. Which is only carrying out to its rigorously logical conclusions, be it said, that very religion of patriotism which has long since been sprouting right here in our own country! For what does it mean when we plant the national flag upon our altars and observe as holy days the national holidays of the state? What does it mean when, in peace or war, Congress passes laws which are described as prior in authority to God's laws, and the Supreme Court declares that, in any dispute between the voice of Congress and the voice of conscience, the former and not the latter must be obeyed? What does it mean when churchmen as chaplains put on the uniform and bless the arms of Caesar for the work of death? It means that we are already started in this country upon the business of substituting a religion of nationalism for the religion of Christ. Hitler is only doing *in extremis* and unashamedly what we have as yet only done timidly and hypocritically. But beware!—the virus is in us, for will not already a million men die for country where only one will die for God?

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT HARVARD

The academic freedom issue, raised at Harvard in the case of Dr. J. Raymond Walsh and Dr. Alan R. Sweezy, as at Yale in the case of Dr. Jerome Davis, has been handled at the former institution in a way which contrasts strangely with the mumbling and muddling at the latter. It is a curious accident, by the way, that this pressing issue should have been raised in this same year at these two most distinguished universities of the country. At Yale the issue was clear. Protests within and inquiries without agreed in condemning Yale for ousting a devoted and learned professor because of his radical views and activities. Yet Yale took no steps either to justify her action or to confute her critics. She simply stood pat on certain statements and announcements which were worse than futile. At Harvard, suddenly, the same issue arose. Walsh and Sweezy were given "terminating appointments," and they were men, like Davis, widely known for their sympathy with labor and radical reform generally. Outside there was an instant cry of protest and a fierce denunciation of the University. Inside there was action by a group of 131 of the junior teaching officers, who addressed a petition to nine of the senior and more eminent members of the faculty asking them to conduct an investigation. Promptly President Conant joined the petitioners, asking the nine men to make the inquiry on behalf of the University itself as well as of their younger colleagues. Than this nothing could be finer. It is action worthy of Harvard's best traditions and of the ideal of academic freedom everywhere. It not only puts the University on the side of truth, but it places the whole question where it properly belongs—in the hands of the faculty. Yale, in such a crisis, fell back on sheer power and authority, and therewith betrayed her own cause. Harvard, in a like predicament, seeks liberty of inquiry by those best fitted to practise it, and therewith vindicates the truth. Harvard is "Fair Harvard" still!

A GREAT PSYCHOLOGIST

Alfred Adler, dead on May 29th last, forever to be remembered with Freud and Jung as the pioneer of a new psychology, will be deeply mourned both in Europe and America—and nowhere more deeply than in the Community Church in New York City. It was under the auspices of this church that Dr. Adler gave his first lectures in this country. It was in this church that he organized his first clinic. It was with the staff of this church that he was associated when he died. Alfred Adler was characterized by a profound sanity as well as a depth of insight which amounted to genius. He was one of the first to appreciate the epoch-making researches of Sigmund Freud, and one of the first also to recognize the limitations of that supreme explorer of the inner life of man. Adler could not believe that sex was the one influence at work in human life, nor that sex repression accounted for every abnormality, nor that sex release would cure every mental ill. When he discovered, or conceived, the "inferiority complex," he made a contribution to psychoanalysis no less important than that of the master himself. It was as though a door swung open into darkness and let in the light! Equally important was Adler's constant iteration of the precept of "coöperation." The bane of all psychological inquiry is the turning of the mind in upon itself. The besetting danger is self-absorption, self-pity, the loss or even alienation of human sympathy. Adler met this peril by a philosophy as wholesome as it was simple. The healing for all our personal ills of the spirit was to be found in keeping in touch with our fellowmen. To coöperate with others in the mutual tasks of life—this was the salvation of our own souls. Here Adler came very close to religion. Indeed, what was his fundamental message but a rereading of the gospel teaching, "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life . . . shall find it"? More than any other psychologist of our time, Alfred Adler understood that the mind is a spiritual and not a mechanical phenomenon. He led the way to a revindication and rededication of religion.

Jottings

The more we study the new automobile models, with their long, rounded hoods protruding over their engines, the more we have the feeling that automobiles today are carrying around with them their coffins for the inevitable fatal accident.

Dictators are nothing new. One would think, to read of Hitler and Mussolini, that the world has never seen their like before. Why, the nineteenth century was full of dictators—Metternich, Cavaignac, Radetsky, Napoleon III. But they all passed—some soon, some late—and democracy marched steadily on.

"His bride, who now becomes her Grace, seemed particularly charming on this, her third wedding day."
—Special despatch in the New York *Herald-Tribune* on the Windsor wedding.

Read all the implications and explications contained in this one sentence, and you have the whole story of the historic abdication of Edward VIII.

Those supporting and those opposing the President on the Supreme Court issue have been embarrassed by the company they have found themselves keeping. Embarrassment is increased on both sides by the discovery that Dr. Townsend is opposed to the President, while the editorial staff of *Townsend's Weekly* are all for him. The Townsendites, like every other group in the country, are completely split on this issue. That's why, we imagine, feeling runs so high everywhere.

The managers of a pageant in Leeds, England, found it impossible to get a girl to play the part of Lady Godiva, and so had to get a boy. We suppose this story is true—we saw it in the New York *Times*. But we had not realized that English girls were so utterly different from American girls!

"Jottings" goes on its annual vacation with this issue. Good-bye until the first issue of next October!

J. H. H.

Mediation in Spain

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD

Ending a war from the outside by means other than military is the untried field of action awaiting pacifist exploration. The need is for a single influential statesman unconventional enough to explore the field.

The raging conflict in Spain, threatening us all, is as dangerous as a forest fire with the wind blowing our way. The present League of Nations has no machinery yet that can smother the first sign of fire in the world forest. Makers of the League Covenant, possessed by the prevailing belief in force, left in it a dangerous threat of ultimate military sanctions which defeats every attempt to evolve the proper fire-fighting unit for civilized use. We who work for the establishment in our time of a World Government must understand that no army, verbally disguised as a "police force," will ever be a safe instrument. Within or without the League we are all endangered by every spark. Our ocean fire brakes will not save the United States much longer. Isolation is nonsense. Today the forest is continuous and dry as tinder. All the more desperate the need for a quite unprecedented action in the international arena!

De Valera of the Catholic but liberal Irish Free State might fill the bill as mediator in Spain. Or Benes of democratic new Czechoslovakia. Or the Scandinavians, who know so well how to save their countries from war. Mediation might be offered Spain by the dying Pope. Of them all, our President, safe in his second term, is the ideal mediator.

If he had turned from diplomacy and plunged whole-heartedly into the game of making peace, President Roosevelt might have spoken any day all this long year the magic word to end the war in Spain. The State Department knows our great potential influence but, like other less important foreign offices, it still hesitates. Why has the Administration not wanted to act?

It would be easier than most Americans realize for our country to assume the moral leadership we owe the world. We are like a young giant, too inexperienced to know our strength, but respected and deferred to whenever we speak out plainly. If our mediation seemed a mistake and caused a refusal of our services, the immense privilege of the United States would not be disturbed. The failure of our country always to cast its weight for peace has been the one great blunder of the century.

If President Roosevelt took the chances and sent a public message to both sides in Spain urging unconditional immediate armistice, his generous offer of mediation might possibly be rejected at first, by one or both sides, but the plain humanity of it would dispel our nightmare of agonized inertia and start widening circles of public reaction against war. A preliminary failure could not but pave the way to final and prompt success.

Secret offers do no good. Unless the war is already won or lost, military governments always refuse them. Private soundings, no doubt, go on all the time between foreign offices, each waiting for the consent of all before taking one public step. But such negotiations have kept peace away from Spain for nearly a year and deserve no respect. That kind of thing is always done by the big diplomats,—if only to keep little diplomats busy. When the high command says stop, the diplomats will pull the strings. Then we shall be allowed to go ahead and

prepare the public for an armistice—too late to do any good!

It is fatal to let the State Department hold us back from action for the quickest possible peace in Spain. To leave peace terms to the military outcome is to renounce our very faith. Our duty must be to lead and direct public opinion into channels where it can force state departments and foreign offices to act. For us not to know the tactics of our friends, the enemy, is criminal ignorance, and peace leaders who play into the hands of the State Department are suspect, worse than useless to our cause.

The public action and lots of publicity are what we need, but where are our intellectual leaders? Organizations formed solely for peace action hesitate in the Spanish crisis, their belief in non-military action shaken by the issues at stake. We have weakly waited month after month, discouraged by official voices, not trusting our own instincts, afraid of ridicule, partisan in the war, or helpless cynics with no trust at all in human intelligence. Democracy in Spain stirs some of us to fighting pitch. But democracy in practice here and now—we the demos using our power to call a halt to war anywhere and everywhere? No, we are hardly up to that—passive pacifists and imitation democrats!

It is needless to suggest any direct attempt at mediation to a petrified peace movement unwilling even to urge governmental action. Delegations go to Spain for every other purpose. First they joined the army or brought tanks, planes, and machine guns. They take ambulances and medicine now. They patch up the wounded, feed the children, nurse the sick, move the population of whole cities. But a peace delegation to try mediation? Certainly not!

The best the old-fashioned diplomats could do was to go into a huddle over Non-Intervention. Without intending to end too quickly their foreign interference or help for Spain, they have for months dangled the word—spelled with capitals—before us, and somehow Non-Intervention has succeeded in deflecting all sensible pressure to end the war. It may be only a ruse or it may be the highest ideal of the old school. In any case it is not our ideal. If it were ever possible to have strict Non-Intervention in Spain, we could not consent to stand by and watch a war of extermination.

Uneasy consciences are giving rise in England to a movement for "humanizing war"—sparing civilians, I suppose. How out of date! Modern war spares no one. Any one with a conscience had better face the fact that the world cannot afford war of any kind. We have too much at stake—all that can properly be called civilization, everything cooperative and truly democratic.

Unshaken by the hue and cry of the "fight for democracy," I refuse to help any one else fight for it. High-sounding principles like democracy, equality, freedom are peculiarly useful to war-mongers, but for me they are outranked by the strong life principle implanted in every woman's heart to preserve the race. A modicum of brains added to that instinct shows me that we no longer need to kill and rob our neighbors wholesale in order to keep our particular tribe alive. War is an anachronism because the new loyalty is all owed to the modern manifestation of the ancient principle of coöperation.

Many old friends, once pacifist, claim we must fight Fascism. Facism means war, they say. If any abstract cause were worth fighting for—or against—Facism would serve very well. It is black enough to be a perfect bugaboo, with all its sins plus that necessary mystical element of the unknown. The causes of what they call Fascism are not understood, either, but radicals waste little time explaining them or trying, wherever there is a chance, to eradicate them. And I mean long hard legislative campaigns where we can still appeal to voters. Real democracy, in short.

Their program sounds simpler: Hate Fascism. Next, hate all the people who live in Fascist countries or serve in its armies. If we are getting ready for war—and who is not?—we need personal enemies. Helpless boys drafted into Franco's rebel army, Spanish, Italian, German, or Moroccan, have got to be killed. We must consider them fiends, hate their mothers, too, and ruin their cities. Same old tale! I simply do not believe it, although I can understand the strong emotional appeal of the Spanish government, once so courageously democratic. No country and no government is democratic while at war. But the left wing sympathizers will not admit that war always means Fascism. War in Spain is an exception, according to them.

They are as impervious to pleas for armistice as the military leaders themselves. Generals, rebel or loyalist, must not contemplate a truce; they study one strategy only, how best to drive men to battle. True friends of Spanish democracy, on the other hand—and almost all pacifists belong in the list—consider every possible strategy for saving modern Spain. But friends of the Spanish government are little by little inflaming American opinion to the point of fever where a new Holy War is possible whenever the time comes and the stage is set and the big militarists are ready. Then war-fever of any origin will be welcome, all unthinking emotion will be grist to their mill.

We need self-control and clear heads and a sensible program of action for peace in Spain. Democratic forces pushing for a truce could control the mediation offered. Therefore from the first day of war we should have been exerting pressure for and on the disinterested mediator or mediators chosen for the job. It was not a question this time of neutral governments since all governments maintain a legal status of neutrality, yet few are actually neutral.

Remaining passive and missing our cue in the first act will not help us play a star role when the peace settlement is staged. But in our minor part we must, of course, exert whatever influence we may still have on public opinion when peace terms are officially discussed; and, before that, confine ourselves to our proper sphere, bringing an end to war in Spain. Partisans and those of academic and sporting interest, whom we have always with us, will continue to discuss or bet on the exact terms of peace. Practical pacifists will not let hypothetical discussion distract them from peace action. They will know that our only useful contribution at the present time is public pressure to end the actual slaughter.

Unwilling to abandon hope, I have withheld

too long my public arraignment of the majority of peace organizations. An earlier scolding might have made converts before it was too late. This week I already see "Armistice" in the headlines. "Truce Imminent in Spain," and it looks like the beginning of the end. Imposing conditions while asking for a truce is not the quickest way to get it, but I hope Eden's paradoxical proposal none the less means some kind of truce before long—evidently not the kind we could have made if we had gained public support. What can be expected now under auspices of the big powers other than a pre-arranged dictated settlement?

When Hitler and Mussolini get tired of helping Franco and give the sign, then so-called democracies put on an act that looks humanitarian. Roosevelt may soon be tipped off to become the spontaneous mediator—then the Nobel Prize and glory as a peace-maker, like cousin Theodore! It is impossible to be enthusiastic about the prospects of Spanish democracy under this set-up. Losing our chances to function as pacifists, we seem doomed to watch from the side lines one more re-enactment of ancient history, another military peace imposed by military elements.

En Route to Geneva,
May 30, 1937

Reconciliation in Religion

VICTOR S. YARROS

Of all modern liberal movements, that designed to promote reconciliation in religion and friendly coöperation of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in the fields of civic reform, benevolence, social understanding, and sympathy, is the most hopeful and encouraging. What has already been done in that movement is wholly admirable. But there are wider possibilities before it, and the time has come to direct some attention to those. Here and there, assuredly, small groups of educated, earnest, and forward-looking men and women in the movement in question, or outside, should be willing to consider ways and means of extending the movement and enhancing its moral and cultural value.

Each age, as we know, has its own spirit, its special approach to problems, its intellectual fashions and tendencies. Our age is apparently indifferent to the old type of secularism and free thought. It is equally hostile to narrow, crude, pseudo-scientific "materialism." It is decidedly skeptical, yet somewhat disillusioned in respect of the power and efficiency of Science. It feels that there is *something* in Bergson's intuition, and that the claims of reason have been extravagant. It is, of course, Pragmatic and "Instrumentalist," even if many of our contemporaries have not heard of those terms, but at the same time it is dimly aware of the fact that laboratory methods and controlled observation have no absolute monopoly of Truth.

It seems to the writer that our age is eminently fitted to attack the problem of religious reconciliation in the deepest possible sense of that phrase. There is a growing demand for a new synthesis, or a new synthetic philosophy, since, admittedly, our age is one of moral and social transition, and we are confused and perplexed. But the longing for a new philosophy of life is perhaps premature. We are not ready for it, because our analytical work is not finished. We must continue to dissect, separate, distill, trace, and verify.

Certainly we are not ready for a religious synthesis. Tolerance is a virtue and a necessity, but it is not the same as comprehension and appreciation. The latter states of mind and heart are essential to a synthesis.

In religion, comprehension and appreciation involve a candid determination of what is essential, what is accidental, and what is local, ephemeral and therefore inconsequential. The most devout believer will concede that the Bible—the Old and the New Testament—cannot be properly understood without taking into account the tone, color, and atmosphere of the periods covered by it. There is a great deal of symbolism, metaphor, figurative speech, and orientalism in the Bible. No intelligent person takes the whole Bible literally. The fundamentalists are fundamentally ignorant of history, of the results of research, of scholarly criticism.

Let us consider here the essentials of the two great modern religions—Judaism and Christianity. Are the essentials the same, or different? If different, wherein do these religions differ, and what are the practical consequences of such differences? And, for answers to these basic questions, let us go to the sources and the founts.

The writer heard Dr. Judah L. Magnes, Chancellor of the Hebrew University, in Palestine, ask a very distinguished audience: What is this thing called Judaism? He essayed no answer, but why not let the prophets of Israel speak for him? Micah, speaking for all of them, tells that all that the Lord requires of us is "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God." We have been told again and again that all thoughtful and devout persons cherish these simple words.

Amos, who so bitterly complains of, and so sharply reproves, Israel, asks them to "hate evil, love good and establish judgment in the gate." He speaks plainly of their transgressions—they oppress the poor, crush the needy, take bribes, and turn aside the poor. He demands that "judgment run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."

Isaiah denounces rebellious princes who love gifts and follow after rewards. He exhorts Israel to relieve the oppressed, plead for the widow, cease to do evil, and learn to do well.

He hates and chastises the tyrants who rob the fatherless and the widows, take away the right from the poor, and turn aside the needy.

Ezekiel's catalogue of sins includes oppression, robbery, vexing the poor and needy, and wronging the stranger.

The prophets, to be sure, also condemn idolatry, lechery, incest, profanity, and vulgar exhibitionism. But the crimes and sins against one's fellows, not excepting strangers, are condemned as wrathfully and fiercely as those against God and individual purity.

The gospel of the prophets is thoroughly social, and the word they use again and again is Righteousness.

In the New Testament, on the other hand, the emphasis is upon Love. The gospel of Jesus and his disciples is of course also profoundly social, but it is far more radical than that of the prophets. It is a commonplace that few so-called Christians practise the explicit and peremptory commands of Jesus. Even the most orthodox, who insist that Jesus was the son of God, miraculously conceived, and that belief in his divine origin and divine birth, as well as divine mission, is essential to salvation, never think of the inescapable and irresistible conclusion—namely, that the plain and positive commands of Jesus must be obeyed in spirit and to the letter. To love him is to obey him, as he himself said. To ignore and violate all his injunctions and doctrines is to deny not only his divinity, but his wisdom and his importance to humanity. I do not suggest that the so-called Christians who utterly fail to live up to the teachings of their "savior" are wilful hypocrites. The human conscience is exceedingly elastic. Men believe what they wish to believe, and easily rationalize their conduct. Or, if they cannot find any respectable justification for their conduct, they simply refuse to face the fact; they manage to avoid and forget the unpleasant subject.

But the avoided facts are still facts. The teachings of Jesus and his first disciples are too terribly explicit. What, according to them, is "the law and the prophets"? This—"all things whatsoever that ye would that men should do to ye, do ye even so to them." The commandments that elaborate and dramatize this general injunction are: Resist not evil; love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; give to him that asketh thee; thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself!

How are these principles exemplified in business, finance, industrial relations? We know the answer.

How many devout Christians or organized bodies of Christians have the courage and the consistency to demand, even, the abolition of capital punishment?

True, the first commandment, Jesus said, is to love God with all one's heart, soul, and mind, but the second is as great as the first. Moreover, just what is meant, and what *can* be meant, by loving God? It is impossible to love something one cannot comprehend or imagine, something unknowable, inscrutable, and inconceivable. One cannot love a power which beggars all forms and means of human expression. When we speak of God as a person, we use childishly anthropomorphic words. What do we know of persons? Nothing not based on our experiences on this planet—on our knowledge of ourselves and our fellow-creatures.

Matthew Arnold was right when he declared impatiently that we can do nothing directly for God, and that to serve him is not to sing his praises, to pay him glowing compliments, to assure him of his omnipotence and omniscience, but to do his bidding as Jesus and the other prophets sum it up for us in their ethical precepts and injunctions.

Is this a narrow, false, arbitrary view? Again, let us ask the highest authority. Jesus poured withering scorn on the scribes "which devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayers." These, he said, "shall receive greatest damnation." He always demanded deeds, and wrathfully rebuked the glib tongue and the empty profession.

Can faith alone save a man? asks James. And he answers: "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead."

And John exclaims: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar."

It is not necessary to multiply quotations on this point. A religion which does not control and shape conduct is sheer hypocrisy, and the fact that the Christian world is a vast hypocrisy is one of the most amazing paradoxes of civilization.

The men and women of our day who are earnest, sincere, thoughtful, and truly religious should refuse to perpetuate that hypocrisy and resolve to make their faith vital and significant. This they can do only by fighting the injustices, the cruelties, the shameful evils of our civilization. They must do justly, love mercy, and cultivate humility. They must socialize or moralize their mills, factories, shops, banks, and stores. They must do away with child labor, with exploitation, with speculation, with juggling, with larceny, with fraud. They must restore equality of opportunity, economic liberty, and democracy. They must promote coöperation and production for service. They must combat and eradicate monopoly in every field—land, finance, exchange, trade. This, in modern terms, is the meaning of justice. The alternative is plutocracy, with slavery for the masses, ill-gotten wealth for the few, the triumph of greed and cupidity and cunning over the decent and humane elements in our common human nature. The enemy today is Plutocracy. Its slogans are hollow and deceptive and its appeal to constitutionalism is insincere. A new social order is emerging, and the only reconciliation worth discussing in religion, as in ethics, is a reconciliation inspired, animated, guided by the desire to facilitate the peaceful evolution of that new order. Quarrels over superstition, dogma, myths, and symbols at a time like ours argue intellectual barrenness and moral poverty.

America's Travail

Change fills the air, driving relentlessly,
Uprooting the past and its customs;
As winds of rebellion swirl through our halls,
And the din of the masses drums in our ears:
America's heart is pounding!

Fear is the freight of this stirring,
Rising stark from the depths of man's feeling;
Fear that excites and stifles the mind;
Swiftly it comes with the charge of the rebel:
America's soul is awakening!

Hope speaks amid chaos and shouting;
Raucous cries drown it in vain.
The gestation of new life is upon us;
The pangs of an era coming to be:
America's spirit is living!

Courage, whisper the breezes,
Men die that mankind may triumph;
Sorrow is the way of all being;
Peace is the end of all striving:
America's life is beginning!

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

Is Labor Going Too Far?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Many people seem to think so, especially in reference to the epidemic of sit-down strikes, so-called, which has been sweeping the nation in recent months. These are evidently people who believe that labor has a fixed status in society, and that any attempt to improve this status, least of all to change it, is an attack upon the state and a definite menace to the stability and even security of society. What these people miss entirely is the fact that the labor struggle, which has been going on for years, is not a sudden upheaval of rebellious emotion or revolutionary conspiracy, but an historical process of change which, however unfortunate in some of its occasional and unavoidable episodes, marks progress from a past darkened with oppression and misery into a future bright with promise of human emancipation. Get the labor struggle set in its proper framework, look at it in the perspective of history, and at once "the crooked is made straight, and the rough places plain."

The first thing to remember is that the workers in our modern industrial society—miners, factory-hands, farm-hands, share-croppers, employes generally—are historically the successors of the slaves in the Roman Empire and the serfs in the Middle Ages. These workers do the work of our society, as the slaves did the work of Rome and the serfs the work of the feudal state. Today we think of these workers as free men—and so they are politically, at least in those democratic countries which have made all adult men and women citizens under a government of liberty. But in the economic world there has never been any general enfranchisement, and therefore there is no freedom. The workers are not inaccurately described by some of our radical friends as "wage-slaves," since they exist in an industrial world to which the privileges and powers, the basic human rights, long since established in the political world, have not yet been extended. Certainly these workers are "slaves," however much their slavery is disguised under forms of wages and hours, so long as they are bound for subsistence to a system of toil the processes of which they do not control and the fruits of which they do not enjoy.

The struggle for the emancipation of the workers began about a century and a quarter ago in England, the first of the great industrial nations of modern times. The first step in this struggle was the organization of trade unions—the attempts of the workers to get together, and thus to make common cause in the defense of their rights and the advancement of their interests. Trade unions seem to be as innocent today as fraternal orders, educational societies, or even churches. They are as firmly established and as earnestly sustained as any other social group whatsoever. Not only is there a public opinion behind them, but a body of law which defines and defends their rights. But in the beginning it was not so. Nothing is more interesting than to go back to the early years of the nineteenth century, and see how the first trade unions were received. I have been reading the story as set down by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in their classic book on *The History of Trade Unionism.*

The first trade unions, organized as such, appeared about 1830-34. It is at this time that we first find references in contemporary documents "to some great Power of Darkness vaguely described as 'the Trades Union'."

The next event, after unions were organized, was a sharp reaction of public opinion against them, "soon worked up by the newspapers," say the Webbs, "to a pitch at which it alarmed the employers, dismally excited the imagination of the middle class, and compelled the attention of the Government."

This led to a third development in the fight against trade unions—a statement by the Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, that "he considers it unnecessary to repeat the strong opinion entertained by His Majesty's Ministers of the criminal character and the evil effects of the unions," adding that "no doubt can be entertained that combinations for the purposes enumerated are illegal conspiracies and liable to be prosecuted as such."

"The employers," write the Webbs, "scarcely needed this hint." The next development was inevitable —"amid a storm of obliquy," there came open "conflict with the law"! Arrests and trials of workers, guilty of no other offense than that of organizing unions, culminated in the famous Dorchester case in March, 1834, in which six laborers, sober men, simple-minded Methodists, two of them itinerant preachers, were tried and convicted, and given the monstrous sentence of seven years' "transportation." Tried on the 18th, the prisoners were in the hulks by the 30th, and on the 15th of the next month (April), were on their way to Botany Bay.

This succession of events bears a striking resemblance, does it not, to what has been happening today in the matter of the sit-down strike, which is nothing more nor less than the latest technique devised by the workers for the advancement of their cause against heavy odds. Thus, when the first sit-downs appeared, there was vast alarm. This was whipped up by the newspapers into a frenzy which stirred the employers and, exactly as in the old days, "excited the imagination of the middle class" with a sense of fear and outrage. This in turn "compelled the attention of the Government," and now comes "the conflict with the law" —court injunctions, arrests, trials, and all the general disturbance of prosecution and punishment.

History, in other words, is repeating itself today, as indeed it has been doing right along in all this century of struggle on the part of the workers for an economic enfranchisement to match their political enfranchisement. The same story has been written in stage after stage of the progress of the labor movement. One device after another for enforcing their demands has been invented by the workers and put into effect. At first, as we have seen, it was the simple organization of a trade union. Then it was the strike—the flat refusal to work except under satisfactory conditions. Then came the closed shop in demand for recognition of the union and of collective bargaining. This was followed by picketing, and then simple picketing developed into mass picketing. Now comes the sit-down strike! In every step of this advance, labor has met with misunderstanding, abuse, denunciation, the attention of government, and at last the opposition of the law, with all the suffering, humiliation, and disgrace which attach to criminal liability. The early days which saw the introduction of the union, the strike, and the

closed shop, came long before my time. But I am old enough to remember when picketing was illegal, and every demonstration of labor a battle with the police and the courts, ending all too often in trial and imprisonment, exactly as in the case of old Dorchester.

There is nothing new, therefore, or strange, about the sit-down strike. Is labor going too far? It is not going any farther now than it has gone before in facing and contending against a society not yet ready to deliver the workers from the bondage of dependence and exploitation. Labor is doing no more today than it has done from the beginning. Looking back a hundred years, we find it preposterous that trade unions should ever have been regarded as dangerous, absurd that they should have been described as illegal, and cruel that workers should have been convicted and ferociously punished for the "crime" of organizing peacefully in their own interest. In the same way, a hundred years hence, our descendants will look back upon this day and find it preposterous and cruel that ever so simple a device as the sit-down strike, which is nothing more nor less than the worker's assertion of a right to his job, should have been denounced as an offense against the state.

If the workers have found themselves in opposition to the law, it is not because they were law breakers yesterday, or are law breakers today. It is rather that, by the law itself, they are rendered outlaws from a society which depends every day of the year upon their toil for existence. The law has been written by the employers to establish *their* power and to protect *their* interests. This is a capitalistic society, and law and order means invariably capitalistic law and order. What therefore can the workers do but protest, and by one means or another attack the law until it is made universal and thus democratic in its application? When once we have a government of all the people, by all the people, in the interest of all the people, there will be no need of strikes, sit-down or any other. Even the trade unions themselves will become superfluous, and disappear like the old guilds of the Middle Ages. For then the state will be the worker's defense, the government his advocate, and the law his "shield and buckler."

Is labor going too far? Labor cannot go too far, at least until the workers are full-fledged citizens of the economic state, members of the social family, and not servants therein nor pariahs therefrom. There are times when the workers, just like other men, make mistakes and do wrong. There are unhappy occasions when they have broken contracts, destroyed or defiled property, been guilty of force and violence. But these offenses are no more characteristic of labor than of capital, and in the case of labor, or the weaker party, they have far more excuse, if no justification. In essence they are accidents and incidents, unfortunate and frequently unavoidable, though always to be condemned, in an historical process which stands in its own integrity as one more struggle for the rights of man. That struggle must be won, and in due time will be won. And then shall we know, as peace returns after strife, that labor was the friend not only of itself but of humanity, and through its own heroic sacrifice has brought in a better day for men.

Kaddish in a Cathedral

BENJAMIN FRIEDMAN*

On Friday nights and Saturday mornings he played the organ and led the choir at the services of the Jewish Temple Society of Concord. On Sunday mornings and Sunday afternoons he sat at the console of the mighty organ of St. Paul's Episcopal Church and directed its choir. For thirty years he alternated between St. Paul's and the Society of Concord. The mysticism of both services touched his soul so that going from the church to the synagogue was like going from the home of one dear friend to that of another.

He was an ambassador of good-will between the members of his church and his synagogue. On Friday night he would tell the rabbi what his rector had preached at the Sunday service. On Sunday he would give the priest a digest of the rabbi's Sabbath sermon. I recall hearing the late Dr. Hadley tell his and my congregation in his original witty way, how good old "Van" acted as the medium of exchange for our sermonic material. As for myself, I feel drawn to St. Paul's largely because of what Mr. Van Deusen made me feel it meant for him.

It was not at all rare for George K. Van Deusen to bring his young Episcopal rectors to the synagogue service. He was proud to acquaint them with Israel's ancient ritual and liturgy. The minister of music and the minister of religion would sit together in the choir-loft listening to the Jewish interpretation of the word of God. Who can doubt but that Mr. Van Deusen was instrumental in fostering a genuine spirit of tolerance in priest and rabbi. He did not do so consciously because he was too sensitive to resort to such direct "good-will" tactics. Whoever saw him play could not help but discern how exalted a place music occupied in his own religious life. He seemed born for the church and became an interpreter of religion through music. He played the music he loved and loved the music he played.

George K. Van Deusen was a true aristocrat in mind and heart. He was the quintessence of refinement. He was cultured, and associated only with the people of culture. It was a joy to have had him as a guest, for he graced one's home by his personality and charm. Jews and Christians who had the privilege of his friendship were always honored by his presence.

Many years ago he said to me, "Rabbi, when I die and am to be buried, promise me that you will recite the Kaddish at my funeral service. It is a beautiful prayer and has come to mean so much to me." When he died my colleague, Rev. Franklin P. Bennett, rector of St. Paul's, called me to participate in the Episcopal service. At the height of the impressive service I recited "Yisgadal, Veyiskadash Shmay Rabbo . . ." It was the Kaddish which he had heard for thirty years on Sabbath eve and Sabbath morning, on Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Passover, Tabernacles and Pentecost. It was his Kaddish which he had come to love as his own doxology.

*Rabbi of the Temple Society of Concord, Syracuse, New York.

My Russian Impressions*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Translated from the Original Bengali by Basanta Koomar Roy

Copyright, 1937, by Basanta Koomar Roy

Author of "Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry"

CONCLUSION

Dictatorship is another theme for discussion. I myself do not like dictatorship in anything. In my own sphere of activities I can never exercise the least possible dictatorship by threat of loss or punishment on one hand, or by the seduction of persuasive language, or by the dynamic insistence of manners on the other. There is no doubt that dictatorship is beset with dangers of various kinds. Harmony and permanency are not certain to attend its activities. On account of incomplete unison between the dictator and the dictated, there arise constant causes for revolution. And again, the habit of being ruled by force weakens both mind and character. When a few harvests of the outward success of this system begin of a sudden to grow weeds, then the inner roots are destroyed.

If the destiny of a nation is not created and nurtured by the collective will of its people, then that country becomes a cage. There may be plenty of food and drink in that cage. But it is never a nest. Continued living in such a cage cannot fail to paralyze the wings of the people. Such a dictatorship, be it of the scriptures, the spiritual precepts, or the political leaders, is the most efficient calamity for the loss of manliness of a people.

Our society in India has been a victim of such impotency for a long time; and we daily notice the evil effects of that impotency. When Mahatma Gandhi declared foreign cloth untouchable, I objected, and said that foreign cloth may be financially injurious to us but it can never be untouchable. But somehow or other, our scripture-dictated blind minds must be cajoled, otherwise we cannot get results. Nothing can be more permanently insulting to the manhood of a people than such a state of affairs. Every country under dictatorship is ever thus hypnotized. When one such juggler disappears, then another invokes a new hocus-pocus.

I admit that dictatorship is indeed a calamity; and I also believe that many deeds of oppression are emanating from this dictatorship in Russia. The sinfully negative side of this dictatorship is oppression. But the positive side of this dictatorship is its system of education—which is totally antipodal to all oppression.

When the mind of a general public becomes united in the matter of securing the welfare of a nation, then this united mind functions permanently as a living entity. Those that are greedy for the preservation of their own dictatorship find that the only way to gain the ends of their ambition is to benumb all minds except their own with non-education. In Czarist Russia the general public was engulfed in ignorance for lack of education; and over and above that, universal, religious superstitions crushed the minds of the people, even as a boa constrictor crushes its victim. The Czar could easily utilize this ignorance for his own good. Then in the name of religion he could easily create most ghastly disturbances between the Jews and the Christians, and between the Mahommedans and the Armenians. Thus ignorance and superstition made the country hopelessly divided and exceedingly weak. This made Russia liable to alien inroads. Nothing can be more favorable for the permanence of a dictatorship than such a state of affairs.

As in old Russia, even so in our own country such a state of affairs has been in existence for a long time. Today my country yields to the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. Tomorrow he will be no more. Then other aspirants for dictatorship will grow like mushrooms, even as new *avatars* are welcomed and worshipped by the superstitious followers of different faiths. In China a few personally ambitious war-lords are constantly fighting amongst themselves for leadership. This has been possible because the people are not educated enough to regulate the welfare of the nation by their common, united will. That is the reason why China is torn to pieces today. I cannot imagine that India will be free from such internal feuds over the leadership. And as usual, it is the common people who will be injured, and not the aspirants to dictatorship.

Recently I have noticed in Russia the stern rule of her leader. But that rule has neither adopted the means, nor followed the path, of perpetuating itself. The Czar once followed that path. He weakened the people's minds by lack of education and religious superstition; and he weakened the people's bodies with the lashes of the Cossacks. I do not believe that the present rule in Russia will remain the same forever, but there now reign uncommon endeavors for the spread of education. The reason for such a seemingly incongruous state of affairs is that there is no personal or party ambition for power or wealth. There is an indomitable desire to initiate the general public into certain tenets of their new science of wealth; and then to make men out of the people, irrespective of caste, color, or class. If it were otherwise, then we would have had to admit with the French scholar that it was a great mistake to spread education.

The time is not yet ripe to say whether the Russian economic theory can be fully accepted or not, for this theory of socialism so long only floated mainly on the pages of books. It has never been tried before on such a gigantic scale, and with such paramount fearlessness. They have ruthlessly brushed aside the very greed that has, from the very beginning, been its most fatal opponent. No one today can say for certain how this new way of economic life will finally adjust itself after roving through changes during the experiments. But it can be said for certain that after a long waiting

*Written in the period of 1930.—Editors.

the masses of Russia are now profusely receiving an unfettered education that imparts permanent honor and dignity to their manhood.

We constantly hear the rumor of the cruelty of the present rule in Russia. That may not be impossible. The tradition of cruel rule has ever been running through the pages of Russian history. It is possible that it has not disappeared of a sudden. And yet, the Soviet Government is losing no opportunity in proving to the people, by means of motion pictures, the evident cruelty of the Czarist rule, and the barbarity of its oppression. If the present government also has adopted the same policy of cruelty, then to create such a strong feeling of bitter hatred against cruelty itself, is, if nothing else, a strange error of judgment. If the cruelty of the Black Hole of Shirazdowllah were everywhere in India made an object of contempt by cinemas, then the same propagandist could not help admitting that the Massacre of Amritsar was at least stupid. In such circumstances a double-edged weapon generally wounds the possessor of the weapon.

A titanic attempt to shape public thought and opinion in the same mould of Marxian economic philosophy is quite evident in Russia. In order to gain this much-coveted end, they have forcibly closed all the avenues of free discussion on this matter. I believe that this allegation against Russia is true. During the last European war public opinion was gagged the same way. Those opposing the war of the governments were either imprisoned or hanged.

Wherever the greed for immediate results is inordinately strong, there the politicians are unwilling to recognize the right of human beings to their freedom of thought. They say: "We shall take care of things like freedom of thought afterwards; for the time being success must be won." The situation in Russia is exactly like the one that prevails during war time. Their enemies are within; and their enemies are without. On all sides the forces of treachery and violence are constantly at work to totally ruin the entire experiment that is going on in Russia. So they are anxious to make the foundation of their policy of construction as permanently strong as possible, and in the least possible time. To gain this end, they do not hesitate the least to make use of force. But, no matter how urgent be their need, violence is a one-sided instrument. Violence destroys; it does not create. There are two factors in the problem of construction: the elements must be made favorable, not by force, and then we must respect their inherent law.

Russia is engaged in making roads to a new cycle of existence. They are uprooting the roots of old laws and traditions from their old soil. They are reproaching the comforts of their accustomed customs. Such an enthusiasm for destruction creates a kind of whirlpool. When human beings fall in such whirlpools, then they cannot fathom the depth of their own enthusiasm; and their challenge increases in potency. They forget that man is endowed with enough time to tame human nature by patient devotion. They rather think that human nature has to be torn from its roots, and then be tamed through a process of abduction, without any reference to its unwelcome consequences. Those that are not endowed with enough patience to use adequate time to change the course of human nature have to believe in force. But at last what they build overnight by the violence of their hands and their feet cannot be depended upon; and they collapse under the pressure of time.

I do not have much confidence in the haughty dictators of the lands where theories are already prepared. Man is far from trained, hence it is not wise for any man to have implicit faith in his own opinion at the very beginning. A man comes to know the value of his opinion after making experiments with it.

It is strange that the same leaders who do not believe in the scriptures of religions are at the same time immobile in their devotional attachment to the scriptures of their economic faith. And they are more than anxious to conform mankind to the tenets of their faith even by tortuous means. They seem to fail to realize that any conformity by force does not invariably prove the truth of the theory. In fact, untruth generally keeps harmonious company with violence.

There was a time when the Europeans had such a vigorous faith in their Christian Scriptures that they did not shrink at breaking the bones and the heads of human beings, or burning them alive only to prove to them the truth of their Scriptures. Today both the friends and the enemies of the Bolshevik philosophy of life are using such arguments of physical violence. Each complains against the other that the right to man's independence of thought is being outraged. Thus in Europe today human nature is being pelted and injured from both sides. And I am reminded of a *Baul* song of old Bengal:

"Cruel man,
Wilt thou, in a hurry,
Fry the flowers of thy desire on fire?
Thou wishest to blossom such flowers,
And spread their perfume without delay.
Look at my Lord of Creation!
He takes ages to blossom a flower,
And he is never in a hurry.
Thy greed is insatiable,
So thy hope liest
In the use of the rod.
How can one remedy such an evil?
O thou cruel man in a hurry,
Please listen to the voice of my Lord,
And learn patience by all means."

I have explained my opinion on the system of education in Soviet Russia. And besides I have also discussed how the Russian citizens of different races and different colors are enjoying equality of rights; and are being glorified by ample opportunities for education. These things have been possible in Russia because politics there are not contaminated by the greed of rapacious profiteers. These two things have moved me with such profound happiness because I am a subject of British India.

Perhaps I now have to answer the question—what do I think of the Bolshevik theory of economics? Many ask me this question. I am afraid our long subjection of Brahminical priestcraft has made us extremely credulous. Our stupefied mind is inclined to believe as gospel truth all the stories that are imported into India from foreign shores. Freeing ourselves from the tentacles of the hypno-

tism of British propaganda, we have to say that a theory can be judged only by its application. The experiment is not over yet. Human nature is the principal factor in the judgment of human affairs. It takes much time to find out how far human nature can harmonize with a theory. One must wait before he fully and finally accepts a theory. But this does not preclude discussion on the subject—a discussion not in terms of logic, or mathematical precision, but in terms of human nature.

A man has two sides to his life—in one way he is independent, and in the other he is a part of the whole of human society. If you take one of these out of human life, the other that remains becomes unreal. When under the insistent pressure of an irresistible inclination man loses himself in the labyrinth of his one-sidedness only to lose his balance, and finds himself making mischief after mischief, then advisors appear to shorten the duration of the danger, and advise the man to ignore the other side of his life altogether. When rugged individualism reaches the very core of poisonous selfishness to create various dangerous disturbances, then the advisors appear to say: "Just cut out self from selfishness, then everything will be all right." This may lessen the disturbances; but it may stop progress altogether. When the rein is torn, the horse is apt to run the carriage into a ditch. At such moments one is apt to think of shooting the horse dead. But that will not make the carriage move smoothly. One should, instead, think more of the rein than of killing the horse.

It is true that human beings fight and rob each other because their bodies are different. But then to propose to tie tightly all human bodies into one gigantic human being befits only a Czar intoxicated with wealth. It takes more stupidity than courage to try to destroy the law of God to its very roots.

In the past the human society in India was mainly in the village community. In these closely interrelated village communities there existed a harmony between individual property and the communal property. And public opinion was of such a character that the rich man felt it dishonorable to spend all his wealth for his own enjoyment. He felt obliged to the society for having accepted favors from him. In other words, there was no such thing as charity in the life of India's past village communities. Wherever there was dearth of wealth there was the home of the wealthy. And in order to preserve his own self-respect in such a community, the rich man had indirectly to pay heavy taxes in different ways. Things like pure water supply, medical aid, education, temples, music, theatres, roads, and other public utilities were sustained not from taxes to the king, but from the currents of individual wealth toward the wealth of the community. Thus there existed a harmonious interplay between individual freedom and the will of the community. This was possible because giving and taking were not manipulated by political machinery. It was rather a spontaneous flow of the will of man. So there was a dominant element of religious consecration in it. In other words, it was not merely an outward effect of the application of law; it rather tended towards the inner culture of the soul of the individual man. This individual culture is the most permanently beneficial and fundamentally vital factor in human society.

Members of the merchant class whose principal business in life was to manufacture wealth out of property were the fallen ones of society; for wealth was not highly honored. So the great difference between wealth and non-wealth was absent in those days. Thus wealth was honored not for its immense acquisition, but for the fulfillment of its great responsibilities. Otherwise it faced disgrace on all sides. In other words, it was righteousness that was honored; and not riches. So in showing this honor, no one was deprived of his self-respect. Those days, however, are gone, and in different forms we see signs of impatience with the new socially irresponsible wealth. For wealth no longer glorifies man; it rather degrades him.

European civilization, on the other hand, from the very beginning has sought to be closely knitted with cities. In cities man is favored with stupendous opportunities. But human relationship takes a back seat there. The city is very big; man is scattered; individualism reigns supreme; and the pressure of competition is crushing indeed. The splendor of wealth widens the gulf between the rich and the poor. And the touch of charity affords no consolation—no honor. There is, of course, a financial connection between those that possess wealth there, and those that are mere beasts of the burdens of wealth. But the social relationship is either disrupted or perverted.

Then began the machine age; and the percentage of profit grew incredibly high. Soon the epidemic of this plague of profit began to spread all over the world. And the alien and the distant races and nations became hopelessly helpless. China had to swallow opium; India had to ignobly surrender her traditional wealth; and the sorrows of Africa grew by leaps and bounds. This is the story of foreign countries. But the story of the present cleavage between the rich and the poor of the western nations themselves is very cruel indeed. The difference becomes so aggressively prominent on account of the expensive standard of living and the oppression of the growing necessities of life. In the ancient days, at least in our country, the splendors of wealth reflected the best from righteous gifts and deeds; now they reflect the most from personal enjoyment of luxury.

The latter strikes us with wonder; but does not make us happy. It awakens jealousy in man; but can claim no praise. The most important thing to remember in this connection is that the use of wealth for social welfare in those days did not depend solely on the will of the wealthy. The will of the community exerted a great influence on the wealthy. Consequently the wealthy had to offer their gifts to society with humility. Our scriptures say: "Thou must give with reverence." This was true to life in those days.

The present personal acquisition of wealth is endowing the rich with the possession of so much power that it has nothing to contribute to the honor and happiness of the general public. It adds to the greed of one side, and to the envy of the other. And a vast ocean of difference surges between the two. Competition, rather than coöperation, assumes impossibly gigantic proportions. This com-

petition is between different classes of the same country; and between different nations of the same world. So, ferocious weapons of suspicion are being whetted on all sides. No nation is being able to reduce such weapons of destruction in any way whatsoever. And the peoples of distant lands who are engaged in satisfying the hunger of the demon of luxury of the western nations are getting more and more anemic and lean every decade. Those that boldly imagine that world unrest cannot lodge itself in the widespread world of emaciated human bodies are certainly goaded by the blindness of their own audacity. It is strange that the unfortunate victims of chronic sorrow are the principal supporters and sustainers of the messengers of these gods of sorrow. In their hunger, however, is gathering the fire of the flames of the doom.

At such a non-human stage of modern civilization appeared the Bolshevik theory of life. Where there is a thinness of air in a certain locality of the sky, there rushes the storm assuming furious forms of destruction, gnashing its teeth of lightning. This Bolshevik Revolution is of the same nature. This unnatural revolution has appeared on earth because the equality of human society has broken down. The contempt of the community by the individual was ever on the increase. So in the name of the community there rises today the suicidal proposal of sacrificing the individual altogether. Because there is an eruption of a volcano on the seashore, hence the ocean is being declared as our only friend. But when we shall fully realize the nature of the endless ocean, then we shall again be anxious to climb its shores. Man will never forever endure the unreality of the community without the individual. We must conquer to subdue the forts of greed in human society; but who would save society by crushing the individual out of existence? It is not impossible that Bolshevism is the cure for this sick age. But a treatment cannot be forever. In fact it is indeed a happy thing for a patient when he does not need his doctor any more.

I wish that in every village of our country the production and distribution of wealth were victoriously carried on, on a coöperative basis. For there is a coöperation in this system. And in this coöperation neither the thought nor the desire of fellow coöoperators is under reproach. So we take full cognizance of human nature. All force is sure to finally fail that antagonizes the wholesome currents of human nature.

Here it is necessary for me to add that when I wish that the villages of our country be revitalized again, I do not wish that the villageness of the villages be brought back again. By villageness I mean that kind of tradition, that kind of education, that kind of intelligence, that kind of faith, and that kind of action which has no connection whatsoever with the wide world beyond the bounds of the village. The field of modern education and intelligence is world wide, even though human sympathies have not attained such an expansion as yet. We have to develop a spirit in the village that is neither negligible nor narrow—a spirit that neither dwarfs human nature, nor envelops it in darkness.

Once in England I visited a farmer's home in a village. I noticed that the women of the family were restless for a visit to London. In comparison with the all-round pomp of prosperity of the cities, the villages are so wretchedly poor that the mind of the villager is naturally always being attracted towards the city. The village feels like a place of exile to him. In Russia I find that an attempt is being made to wipe out the cold contrast between the village and the city. If this endeavor meets with real success, then the tide of the unnatural overgrowth of cities will be stemmed. Then the physical vitality and the mental energy of the nation will be diffused all over the country; and thus they shall be able to function according to the ideals of their inherent nature.

I most devoutly wish that our villagers, too, instead of living on the leavings of the cities, may attain and enjoy the full honor, and the fullest prosperity of their manhood and womanhood. I believe that the villagers can rescue themselves from their present submerged condition only by the coöperative system of production and distribution of wealth. It is certainly a matter of regret that so far the coöperative movement in Bengal is prolonging a miserable existence only by loaning money. It has nothing to do with the coöperative system of production and enjoyment of livelihood.

The coöperative movement was started in our country by officials under the full control of the British government. So, the machinery of the coöperative movement was blind, deaf, and indifferent. And, besides, perhaps I have to admit it with shame, we lack that quality of character which is essential for the success of such a movement. Those who are feeble themselves have but faint faith in each other. Self-contempt is the foundation of contempt for others. This degraded state of existence emanates from loss of self-respect, and loss of self-respect follows long subjection to an alien nation. They accept with bowed heads the rule of the ruling class; but they can never endure the leadership of their own people. It is easy for them to impose upon their own people, and to treat them with unkindness.

I learn from reading Russian story books that the long-oppressed peasants of Russia also suffer from the same malady. However difficult the path may be, there is no other way out. We have to reform our character under the pressure of creating the condition for both physical and mental coöperativeness. We can save the village in India, not by loaning money to the farmers as is done today by the British government, but by making them work together to blossom forth into an impregnable unity of purpose.

Revolt

His stories were always scandal-packed
Without a thought, without a dream.
His channelled mind was ever packed
With many a money-making scheme.

His books have died with him, his heirs
Revolted at all his miser lies.
They left the gaudy house that stares,
A skull with boarded window eyes.

His son is a poet, humbly great,
His poems are dynamite to smash
The order that could tolerate
His father's poison trash!

LUCIA TRENT

The Study Table

New Light on the Old Testament

CULTURE AND CONSCIENCE, AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE NEW RELIGIOUS PAST IN ANCIENT PALESTINE. *By W. C. Graham and Herbert G. May. 356 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. $2.50.*

This is one of the most important books in the Old Testament field that has appeared these many moons. In the main, it is a chronological review of archaeological findings in Palestine which the authors have with meticulous scholarship assembled and appraised in relation to the Old Testament narrative. In addition, it is a running commentary on these findings from the point of view of Dr. Breasted's *Dawn of Conscience,* Professor Mead's *The Philosophy of the Present,* and Professor Haydon's *The Quest of the Ages,* although Dr. Breasted's implications of a profound influence from Egyptian religious practice and thought upon Hebrew monotheism have not been accepted without considerable modification. Behind the book one constantly feels the inspiration and characteristic viewpoint of the late Professor J. M. P. Smith, teacher of both authors, and the later chapters are virtually the demonstration, through archaeological findings, of the thesis of Dr. Graham's recent masterpiece, *The Prophets and Israel's Culture.*

This is an historical book in the most scientific sense of the term, and is, therefore, radically heterodox by the canons of the orthodox version of Hebrew theological development. Moses' ethical monotheism does not stand at the threshold of this evolution, at all, but is accorded a minimum of attention; Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, and Saul are the protagonists of that tribal struggle for freedom from Philistine tyranny which rallied around a local fertility god (baal) called Yah, and made his cultus the morale symbol and the legal sanction of the federated Habiri tribes who formed the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom of Israel. Then the Yahwist prophets, buildings upon the axioms of this social solidarity, sought to purify Yah's cultus of the selfish, cruel, materialistic trends inherent in its fertility aspects, and to stress and glorify the possibilities of great racial destiny through perfect social loyalty and unity—"a notable succession of individuals who could enlarge a range of values, could raise mythology to theology, could purge and purify the social techniques utilized by the priestly custodians of culture," . . . till . . . "there begins to break upon the world the vision of human destiny which has found but partial expression in Judaism and Christianity." (P. 309.) Orthodoxy may, however, find some consolation in the authors' conviction that "no word less meaningful than 'revelation' can adequately convey the significance" of this evolution, for "a bird's-eye view of the cultural history of Canaan permits one, then, to see, amid the kaleidescopic changes of passing time and circumstance, a cosmic undergirding. . . one can see, running through the long centuries a thread of continuity leading on to a better world and back to a cosmic will." (P. 310.)

This signal and sacred "thread of continuity" which the authors are pleased to designate as "revelation" is not always traced clearly enough to be convincing. For instance, the gradual replacement of the "cult of the dead" after 1600 B.C., through Hyskos-Philistine influence, by their imperialistic, hierarchical fertility baal-worship seems to us to have been revolutionary, indeed, but not all the labored arguments of the authors can make it holier or more ethical than the simple, reverent, communal "manitou" religion it conquered! Or was that "revelation," too?

The book therefore, is a kind of philosophy of religious sociology buttressed by constant reference to recent archaeological findings, which, in turn, are correlated with relevant passages in the Old Testament. In its didactic theory, it is obviously an argument with a view to keeping the divinity students of the University of Chicago and of Oberlin conservative enough not to wreck their churches by a radicalism that repudiates old phraseology and rites, yet radical enough to stimulate and guide the humanistic emphases of today upon social and economic reform by the methods of science rather than of "grace." "Without the social expression which is given to a cherished range of values and to a considered view of the nature of the world, through the social operations of the cultus, spiritual progress would be confined to the exceptional individual of genius." (P. 101.) But on the other hand, "organized religion tends too readily to think of its function in terms of social control rather than in terms of social stimulation." (P. xxvii.) We might go on quoting passages of like import, all of them true to history, all of them calculated to make the young Liberal minister, whether Baptist or Congregationalist, bold but not *too* bold! Doubtless this is a valid objective and a right interpretation, but the tendency becomes amusing when one finds it also dominating Professor Wieman's labored efforts to persuade his students to rationalize themselves into using the Christian ideology and phraseology though with a meaning for themselves totally different from that given them by the people in the pews! All very well in its way—but it is not Amos!

If one is able mentally to encyst this indoctrination, the review of Palestinian archaeological discoveries is immensely enlightening. Culture in Palestine developed far more slowly and crudely than in the Nile and Euphrates valleys; evidence of the "cult of the dead," such as cave threshold burials, infant jar burials, barrow and tumulus burials occur much later than one would expect, judging by the Old Testament narrative. Then the Hyskos invasions, about 1500 B. C. seem to have introduced the idea of ritualistic coercion of deity (possibly by human sacrifice) and a kind of animistic fertility cult symbolized by pottery figurines of snakes, doves, mother-goddesses and sacred trees. Thereafter, evidence of fertility cults is abundant, and it is curious to learn that the archangel Michael is probably M-k-l, a fertility god (baal) of Beth-Shan; that Yah of Hebron (?) was probably blessed with a consort; that the star of David, the seal of Solomon, the ark, and even the seven-branched Menorah are relics of such baal-worship; that Joshua, (who may have *preceded* Moses the Levite by a century), Gideon, Samuel, Saul, and David were baal-worshipers and that Canticles may have been part of a ritual of a mother-goddess in which sacred prostitutes were employed! It is also interesting to learn that the copper mines which furnished much of Solomon's wealth have been excavated along the Dead Sea, and that the "cherubim" are simply bull symbols of baal-worship!

Palestinian culture, therefore, was based and built upon fertility cults, among which was that of Yah, the "lord of the covenant" (baal-brith). Philistine oppression stirred the small group of Habiri (Hyskos) tribes south of Jerusalem to revolt, Yah was the deity of their fighting-for-freedom morale, as well as the guardian of their league bond; he lived in the ark (together with the tablets of their covenant), and thus became the god of free, victorious Israel. The Yah prophets exalted his worship at first; then, when the materialism and inhumanity of prosperity sapped the loyalty ethics and morale of Israel, undertook to purify Yah's religion from all traces of the fertility ideology, ritual, and symbolism. But Hebrew Messianism is closely colligated with the fertility cycle of the rising and dying god of vegetation, represented by the Osirian legends, and Jewish religion has never lost, in spite of the prophets' efforts, a strong emphasis upon prosperity as the fruit and reward of Yah piety. For such geocentric, humanistic emphasis, the authors of the book have many words of disparagement, such as: "Any world view which leads to the over-stressing of human supremacy in the scheme of things engenders in Man the humors that belie it." (P. 99.)

With this, and many such judgments in the book, the reviewer feels strong discontent. He even believes that there can be conscience before culture, even within the mesolithic "cult of the dead" and its communal coconsciousness. Conscience begins with the intuitive sense of what is physically, mentally, and socially hygienic; and upon the rude tribal usages and tabus of this sense, law, government, religion, art and all technical skill in living are founded. Conscience in a real and true sense does not begin with "culture" as these authors define it. Such philosophic error, natural to highly individualized and intellectualized thinkers, does not, however, vitiate the high value of the book as a substantiation, through recent archaeology, of radical Old Testament criticism. CHARLES LYTTLE.

The Shadow of a Superman

NAPOLEON'S NEMESIS: THE LIFE OF BARON STEIN. *By Constantin de Grunwald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.75.*

Baron Stein, Marie Louise's mighty minister, twice exiled scourge and final destroyer of Napoleon, founder of modern Prussian militarism, strides jack-booted across M. de Grunwald's brazen pages, flinging down the years—as Luther and Bismarck in the past, as Hitler today—the shadow of a superman. Beneath that somber shadow rests our own world and that of tomorrow. What lies beyond we can only guess.

Preluded (since all our dramas *must* have preludes!) by an ironical overture whose theme is the constitutional incapacity of the Teuton for self-government, the drama, whose stage is set amongst the tangled confusion of German states in the *ancien regime,* loses no time rushing its protagonist to the fore and speeding him upon his destined way: youthful knight of the Empire; 'prentice days at Vienna; Turgot's understudy for Frederick the Great; courtship and marriage; the French Revolution (in *dimminuendo*); Stein's feverish efforts to set Prussia's house in order before impending Napoleonic overthrow; his patriotism plunging Prussia headlong into the catastrophe of Jena; martyrdom of Marie Louise and her sottish spouse at Tilsit; her restoration of Stein to power, and opening his epic career; a galaxy of great reforms, political, military, economic, renovating and revivifying Prussia; his downfall before the brusque demand of Napoleon; exile, and web-weaving, with Talleyrand, at Alexander's court; Europe entangled in the toils, aroused to the War of Liberation; and the downfall of Napoleon before this hard, ruthless, implacable Nemesis, giving momentarily into Stein's hands dictatorship of France, in the aftermath of which, during the Congress of Vienna, his struggles to achieve a united *Vaterland* were foiled by Metternich, and he was thrust into retirement to watch his envisioned Reich fade into an ineffectual Confederation, flaccid, powerless, the shadow of a shade.

But he has done his work. That jack-booted march across the European scene has left deep impress; and that shadow, taking substance in Bismarck von Schönhausen and Adolf Hitler, today rears itself on Teutonic soil an empire, bristling with bayonets, swords, cannonry, defying the entire world to mortal combat. . . . Such, in the large, was the achievement of Stein—what of the man, and, still more, what of the portrait? "Hewn out of a block of granite, solidly homogenous and insensible to finesses and nuances with . . . his square face, his broad forehead, aquiline nose, his penetrating eyes veiled by thick eyebrows, his unequal and slightly humped shoulders that seemed made for a cuirass"—so appears Karl Friederich von and zum Stein, Napoleon's Nemesis and forerunner of German unity, as portrayed in M. de Grunwald's vivid volume—rich in poetry and philosophy, loud and strident with martial music, displaying in addition to that of Stein a whole cortege of greatness, including Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Fichte, Schleirmacher, Humboldt, Hardenberg, Goethe, Alexander II, Metternich, Napoleon. An arresting personality, Baron Stein, aside from his momentous significance; and this long-delayed biography should do much to refresh the world's memory of one of her statesmen, and the greatest but Bismarck ever produced by Germany militant, aroused to arms in a world conflict of which our own is, after all, an amplified echo.

ROBERT SCHALLER.

Major American Poets

MAJOR AMERICAN POETS. *Edited by Harry Hayden Clark. 964 pp. New York: American Book Company.*

Here is a work of the highest scholarship by the eminent Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin, Harry Hayden Clark. This book is a part of the American Literature series of which Professor Clark is Editor. The whole series should be in every library since it is scholarly enough to be used in University and College classes, and at the same time sufficiently untechnical to be enjoyed by the casual reader who wishes to know the literature of America.

The poets selected by Professor Clark are: Freneau, Bryant, Whittier, Emerson, Poe, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Emily Dickinson, Lanier, Whitman, Lindsay, Robinson. The major poems of each of these writers are given in such volume that any one who carefully studies them will have a competent knowledge of the respective poet's work. The second part of the book is devoted to an up-to-the hour bibliography, together with notes on the life of each poet and on each poem studied. The amount of work which has gone

into these excellent notes is so vast that, unless one has edited a writer, he can scarcely begin to measure it. This book is the most complete of its kind in existence.

Professor Clark is to be congratulated on publishing this book at this time. Today we are beginning to try to understand and appreciate the ideas and principles underlying Americanism. As we see democracy, for which America has fought, gradually disappearing from other countries, we begin to ask whether our own heritage is secure. Certainly if we prize our national civilization, we must be able intelligently to appraise it. In the field of American civilization this book must be given a first place.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

An Appeal for Spain

Editor of UNITY:

I enclose herewith a report of a visit we have just had from Professor José Brocca of Spain, member of our International Council, now living in Valencia. I wish you would use the information about our Relief work as much as possible. We desperately want a lot more money for Spain. We have raised nearly £1,000, but it has practically all come from friends in this country with just a little help from our European Sections. We do feel that we now need the support of our U.S.A. friends. I feel confident that if only the right appeal was made, considerable response would come. Apart from the money, which should come direct to us,—as we have opened banking accounts both in Perpignan, France, and Amsterdam, Holland, where we are purchasing food-supplies—there must be a good many firms in the U.S.A. who would be willing to send consignments of food materials direct to Spain. Such consignments of say, condensed milk, coffee, chocolate, tea, biscuits, should be addressed to:

Doctora Amparo Poch,
c/o Señor Juan Grediaga,
Gerencia de Buques Incautados,
Muelle de Tierra No. 4 (Ibarra),
Grao-Valencia, Spain.

Doctora Poch is the President of our Spanish Movement. At the quayside of Valencia we have our own store. Provided we have advance information of what is being dispatched, the date, and name of steamship, we can arrange that these goods are received without any duty or expenses whatsoever. Can you help us at all?

H. RUNHAM BROWN, Sec'y.,
War Resisters International.
11 Abbey Road,
Enfield, Middlesex, England.

[Report]

Professor Brocca arrived in London on the eveing of May 12 and spent the following day at Headquarters—a most valuable time for us from the point of view of obtaining information which we hope will have a good result in making our future work for Spain even more effective than it has been in the past. Professor Brocca is obviously feeling the strain of his great responsibilities—he looks worn and ill—but his heart is entirely with his work and he was eager to get back to it. He left London on May 14, returning via Paris, where he was hoping to meet Eugène Lagot and other friends.

Madrid. Professor Brocca, has set up a Committee of women in Madrid to be responsible for the distribution of food, etc. On this Committee are represented the Women's Committee against Fascism, the Red Cross, Republicans, Socialists, Anarchists, etc. The Committee does not exist solely for the purpose of distribution of gifts for the W.R.I. alone, but works on behalf of other organizations as well.

Special Children's Welfare Centres and Clinics have been set up in Madrid by the Spanish Government. The doctors in charge of these centres supply to the above mentioned Committee lists of children in greatest need who ought to have extra nourishment. There is a grave fear of a serious outbreak of rickets. The representatives of the Committee also go on house-to-house visitations, obtaining information of all the children and old people who do not go to the clinics and who are in need of assistance.

In Madrid there are 25,000 children under two years of age. About one-half of these are in Government Institutions and are cared for by the authorities. This means that there are approximately 12,500 children under two years of age practically unprovided for. They cannot be evacuated because they cannot be separated from their respective mothers, and the latter have their scanty means of livelihood or their husbands in Madrid and refuse to forsake them.

During the daytime the streets of Madrid are practically empty—aerial bombardments and machine-gun firing from low-firing planes are everyday occurrences, and people are afraid to venture out. But as soon as dusk falls, long queues of women and children commence to form outside those shops where there is any food for sale. After hours of waiting they often find that all the little stores have been exhausted, and there is nothing for them.

The provision of milk is quite suitable for the young and old people, but more substantial food is needed for the older children. To help to meet this need, Professor Brocca has obtained canned meat from Holland.

The War Resisters' International has a store on the quayside at Valencia. As soon as Professor Brocca receives advice from us that goods are being shipped, he immediately applies to the Government for exemption from customs duty. This is readily given.

Professor Brocca and his friends recognize that war resistance propaganda is not possible, but they believe that constructive work of this kind, *in the name of pacifists,* is most valuable.

In Madrid the people live on beans, rice, a very little bread (normally their staple food), fruits, cabbage, olive oil. Meat, fish, eggs, flour, potatoes, sugar, coffee, tea, and chocolate are practically unobtainable. The best most mothers can do for their children is to soak some dry bread in water, or to boil and boil the little cabbage they can get, continually adding more and more water, until it is more like cattle-fodder.

Refugees. Those who leave the country or are taken from dangerous zones under official evacuation schemes are provided for by Government plans. But

so great is the number of refugees that many get away outside of any organized scheme. These are in great need, and the International has established contact with a friend of Professor Brocca's living in Perpignan, in the south of France, and to whom is entrusted the distribution of financial help among such refugees.

Children's Colonies. Following proposals made by Professor Brocca and Dra. Poch, several children's colonies have been formed in the south of France, and the W.R.I. has been called upon to supplement their work by financial assistance. Professor Brocca and Dra. Poch also organized the recent transport of 500 Spanish children to Mexico. The greatest difficulty was experienced in getting them safely out of the Mediterranean. The children were therefore sent to Bordeaux by train and embarked there for Mexico.

We informed Professor Brocca of the activities in Spain of other organizations and of the bigger schemes some were able to carry out. He emphasized very strongly the wisdom of the W.R.I. carrying on its Relief Work exactly as it had done in the past, keeping its independent administration of its own funds. He is able to insure that our help is used for the civilian population only. He says that unless very careful supervision is exercised, there is great danger that help may sometimes be diverted to military uses.

From Our Readers

Editor of UNITY:

I wish to congratulate the editors on their articles, or sermons rather, in UNITY of May 17. Unitarian Humanism should have a glorious future, for it has the potentialities of a great movement.

In Dr. Holmes' article, referring to Theodore Parker's education, he mentions that Mr. Parker had read Rollin's *Ancient History.* This is the first time that I remember having seen Rollin's work referred to in any literature. It recalled to mind the fact that when I was about fourteen or fifteen years old I wrestled with that book.

In the May 3d issue of UNITY, Mr. Harry Taylor's article almost brought tears to my old eyes, for I have experienced those Youthful Certainties, and now what? The world, filled with hate, crime, and cruelties, does not present a pretty picture. Let us build altars to the blessed Unity which holds Nature and Soul in perfect solution and compels every atom to serve an universal end.

I am anxiously waiting for the next UNITY.

E. H. BARRETT.

Shelby, Mich.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Editor of UNITY:

It seems to me that very few correspondents who write letters to editors take fully into consideration the policy and aim of the periodical they are writing to. Therefore, when I say I like UNITY, what do I really mean? Do I mean I like UNITY because of its frankness and liberal views? Or do I mean there are parts of the paper I like and parts I don't like?

I am of the opinion that we should pick out what we especially like and thus be more concise in our views, rather than merely make a broad statement. First of all, then, I like the editorials (most of them) because they appear to me as unbiased views.

I am not scholar enough to pass any opinion on such articles as "Theodore Parker and Horace Mann" or "The Education of Theodore Parker." Therefore, I leave them strictly alone. But I am greatly interested in "Modern Unitarianism," written by Curtis W. Reese, because I have had a leaning toward Unitarianism for several years. So the first thing I marked in that article was this—"Modern scholarship and modern means of communication, plus open minds and eager hearts, make us really the heirs of all the ages, and place upon us a special charge to pass on to ages yet to come the spirit that is genuine, the mind that is flexible and the will that sets men free."

I can scarcely believe the statement in "Modern Unitarianism" to the effect that "there are tens of thousands in America who never heard the name Unitarianism, except possibly in connection with President Taft or from the lips of Billy Sunday."

"The Brother of the Unknown Soldier Speaks," by Richard A. Dawson, should find a place in every liberal journal on earth. To me, it is absolutely right; and the very best article, from a human standpoint, in the whole issue of May 17.

JOHN ROWLAND.

Stratford, Ont.

Youth

Editor of UNITY:

Recently John Haynes Holmes spoke in our city and among many profound and realistic statements was one he uttered to this effect: Thousands of boys and girls will soon be graduating from our colleges in America and most of these splendid young people will be unemployed!

Dr. Abram Sachar, world traveler, spoke in our city some little time ago and stated his impression of American youth. He said that in other countries, the youth were busily engaged in some idealistic enterprise for their country, whether right or wrong—at least their hearts were in it! In America there is no incentive offered to youth along similar lines.

Dr. Frankwood Williams also reminded us that our young people had a hard time "finding themselves."

But Anna Louise Strong, in *This Soviet World* (Chapter "Youth Set Free") is not at all troubled about the Youth of Soviet Russia! Here is her statement:

> "What then is the source of the explosive joy which becomes increasingly plain in the words, the sports, the celebrations of Soviet youth? It lies in those words—'young owners.' Men in the past have been subjects of kings or even proud citizens of democracies. Never till socialism dared they call themselves owners of the land in which they live. Ownership brings freedom in planning, clearness of goal, harmony of intellect and will in expanding life. Joint ownership brings comradeship reinforcing freedom, and a new, widened will to conquer space and time."

HENRIETTE POSNER.

Rochester, N. Y.

Coöperative Institute

Editor of UNITY:

We are sending you this communication concerning a Summer Institute and Management Training Course because of the interest of your readers in Consumers' Coöperation.

There is a growing demand for men with grocery store experience and enthusiasm for Consumers' Coöperation to manage new coöperative stores. In order to meet this need, the Eastern Coöperative League is holding a management training course at Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., from July 11 to 24 for a limited number of qualified students.

From July 11 to 17 an Institute will be held for the general public, which will include courses on the history, principles, practices, and philosophy of Consumers' Coöperation, as well as discussions of practical organization problems and addresses by nationally known leaders.

Additional information on either or both of these courses will be furnished gladly.

EASTERN COÖPERATIVE LEAGUE
112 *Charlton St.,*
New York City

The Field

(*Continued from page* 146)

put an end to the epidemic of sit-down strikes. In the long run no other policy will bring stabilization of labor relationships and a substantial measure of industrial peace. The order and peace which have prevailed in the railroad industry in the United States under a regime of collective bargaining furnish eloquent testimony for this contention.

The fact that sit-downs may occur for a time after collective agreements have been made need cause no surprise or alarm. There may be individual leaders or subordinates on both sides who wish to sabotage the new relationship or who lack faith in its possibilities. Under the most ideal conditions, it must take time to work out the details of the new relationship between men and management where such tremendous interests and such large numbers of people are involved.

There are some jurists of standing, though not many, who hold that the sit-down is legal. Nothing is gained, in our opinion, by contending that when workers who have long worked in a plant, who have contributed skill, experience and labor to the prosperity of an industry, sit down peacefully in a plant pending the adjustment of grievances, they are simply "trespassers" like the man who occupies another's home against the latter's will.

When people participate in, or condone, or fail earnestly to protest against, the gross inequalities in distribution of income which exist in our country, refusal of employers to recognize the right to organize, labor espionage, the use of gas and machine-guns against strikers, lynching, war, and preparation for war and then suddenly become indignant about sit-down strikes, truth compels us to remind them of Jesus' saying about those who "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

II. A New Conception of Rights

The attempt to meet and solve the sit-down problem on the basis of legal technicality or in a spirit of hysterical denunciation can end only in disaster. As William Allen White, adviser to Governor Landon in the recent presidential campaign, has pointed out, we are faced with issues not clearly covered by existing laws: "We may be approaching a new phase, a new conception of the rights of property in industry." Until we understand that a new social problem born out of new facts and relationships in industry is before us, "the country will not go far toward solving the current industrial situation."

We believe that it is likely to prove easier to prevent open violence in connection with the sit-down than in connection with the more common forms of picketing. We note with satisfaction the high degree of discipline which sit-down strikers have imposed upon themselves and the scrupulous care of property which they have exercised.

As labor leaders as well as others have pointed out, grave dangers lurk in a possible irresponsible use of the sit-down method. It is our earnest prayer that excesses on the part of labor at this critical hour may not develop to give an excuse to elements which might seek to institute Fascist measures in the United States.

Unhesitatingly, however, we deprecate any attempt on the part of public authorities or of private individuals or organizations to solve the sit-down problem by violence and bloodshed. As in every other sphere, so here, violence will solve nothing, but will make a real solution more difficult. If violence is resolutely kept out, every other problem will be easier of solution, all real values, including even physical property, will in the end be better protected.

We likewise deprecate any hasty legislation against sit-downs, for more stringent regulation of labor organizations, etc. The movement to stabilize labor relationships must have for its first premise the general and wholehearted acceptance of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively, and for the rest must depend on free consultation among the representatives of management, the unions, and the government, as is already the case on the railroads of this country.

III. The Better Way

The sit-down strikes as they have been conducted in the United States are far from fully exemplifying the spirit of non-violence. There is far too much readiness on the part of strikers to resort to violence, when this appears "necessary" and likely to produce "results." Sit-downers have depended in large degree on physical possession of property and physical coercion of non-strikers. Employers and workers and their respective organizations and all other groups in our society think too much in terms of warfare.

It is this same spirit of domination, will to power, violence—trust at last in the sword rather than in reason and love, in the power to hurt rather than the power of sacrifice—which characterizes all of us in all our relationships. Two decades ago this spirit led to the slaughter of thirty million human beings and all the other horrible harvest of the Great War. There is a better way. There is a power in the spirit, symbolized by the Cross, which suffers for a cause but will not inflict suffering, a power in non-violent resistance, greater than all other power. Ultimately we must build life on fellowship and meet social changes in the spirit of love even for the enemy and of faith in the processes of reason and goodwill. We believe that this can be done and we call on all men and women of good-will to join us in thinking out the practical ways of doing it.